

**PRODUCT:** Oleen shampoo. 6 cartons, each containing 6 8-ounce bottles and 1 gallon bottle, and 24 cartons, each containing 4 8-ounce bottles and 1 quart bottle, at Washington, D. C.

Analysis showed that the product contained approximately 20 percent of a polyethylene oxide alkyl phenol and 0.5 percent lauryl isoquinolinium bromide.

**LABEL, IN PART:** (Bottle) "Oleen Dandruff Treatment Shampoo With Hair Conditioner Contains Kurium Directions: Apply directly to scalp and massage. A hot towel may be used if desired. Rinse thoroughly. Apply more to the hair and work up lather, then rinse. Use at least once a week as a regular shampoo to control dandruff. For best results give a double shampoo."

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Adulteration, Section 601 (a), the article contained a deleterious substance which may have rendered it injurious to users under the conditions of use prescribed in its labeling and under such conditions of use as are customary or usual.

**DISPOSITION:** September 18, 1951. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

#### **COSMETIC ACTIONABLE BECAUSE OF CONTAMINATION WITH FILTH**

**193. Adulteration of orrisroot. U. S. v. 181 Bags \* \* \*. (F. D. C. No. 30917. Sample No. 24004-L.)**

**LIBEL FILED:** April 12, 1951, District of New Jersey.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about November 23, 1948, from New York, N. Y.

**PRODUCT:** 181 bags each containing 110 pounds of orrisroot at Bayonne, N. J.

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Adulteration, Section 601 (b), the article consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance by reason of the presence of insects. The article was adulterated while held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce.

The article was alleged also to be adulterated under the provisions of the law applicable to drugs, as reported in notices of judgment on drugs and devices.

**DISPOSITION:** July 2, 1951. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

#### **COSMETICS ACTIONABLE BECAUSE OF ADULTERATION WITH UNCERTIFIED COAL-TAR COLORS**

**194. Adulteration and misbranding of coal-tar colors and the use without proper authority of identification devices authorized and required by the coal-tar color regulations. U. S. v. Interstate Color Co., Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$500. (F. D. C. No. 17823. Sample Nos. 77877-F, 77878-F.)**

**INFORMATION FILED:** May 1, 1946, Southern District of New York, against the Interstate Color Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about April 21, 1944, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania.

**LABEL, IN PART:** "F. D. & C. Mixture Yellow 10013 Part of Certified Lot No. B-3438 Not less than 92% Pure Coal Tar Dye" and "F. D. & C. Mixture Blue 10656 Part of Certified Lot No. B-6088 Not Less Than 88% Pure Coal Tar Dye."

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Adulteration, Section 601 (e), the products were not hair dyes and bore and contained coal-tar colors other than ones from batches that had been certified in accordance with the regulations.

Misbranding, Section 602 (a), the statements "Not less than 92% Pure Coal Tar Dye" and "Part of Certified Lot No. B-3438" borne on the label of a portion of the product were false and misleading in that they represented and suggested that the product contained 92 percent of pure coal-tar dye and that it was a coal-tar color from a batch that had been certified and assigned lot No. B-3438, in accordance with the coal-tar dye regulations, whereas it did not contain 92 percent of a pure coal-tar dye but did contain a smaller amount, and it did not consist of a coal-tar color from a batch that had been certified pursuant to the regulations and assigned lot No. B-3438. The information charged also that the defendants falsely represented and without proper authority used marks and identification devices authorized and required by the regulations, in that the marks and identification devices "Lot No. B-3438" and "Lot No. B-6088" displayed upon the cans were marks and identification devices assigned to other firms for use on batches of certified coal-tar colors which contained 92 percent and 88 percent, respectively, of pure dyes, and were composed of FD&C Yellow No. 1 and FD&C Blue No. 1, respectively, whereas they were not from such batches of coal-tar colors but were uncertified coal-tar colors of a different composition.

**DISPOSITION:** May 6, 1946. A plea of guilty having been entered, the court imposed a fine of \$500.

### COSMETIC ACTIONABLE BECAUSE OF FAILURE TO BEAR MANDATORY LABELING

**195. Misbranding of hydrogen peroxide. U. S. v. 8 Cases \* \* \*. (F. D. C. No. 31192. Sample No. 18194-L.)**

**LIBEL FILED:** June 14, 1951, District of Arizona.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about February 9 and April 4, 1951, by the Monarch Products Co., from Maywood, Calif.

**PRODUCT:** 8 cases, each containing 36 bottles, of hydrogen peroxide at Phoenix, Ariz.

**LABEL, IN PART:** (Bottle) "Hydrogen Peroxide 20 Volume Professional \* \* \* For Hair Bleaching \* \* \* 4 Fl. Oz."

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 602 (b) (2), the article failed to bear a label containing an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents. (The article was short of the declared volume.)

**DISPOSITION:** August 7, 1951. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

### INDEX TO NOTICES OF JUDGMENT C. N. J. NOS. 190 TO 195

#### PRODUCTS

	N. J. No.		N. J. No.
Bonat shampoo-----	190	Hydrogen peroxide-----	195
Coal-tar colors-----	194	Oleen shampoo-----	192
Godan shampoo-----	191	Orrisroot-----	193
Hair and scalp preparations--	190-192,	Peroxide, hydrogen-----	195
	195		